

THE 13th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF



ISSEI

International Society for the Study of European Ideas

in cooperation with the University of Cyprus



The Need for a Genealogical Engagement with Literature **Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment*: A Case Study**

Dr. Roberta Raymond-Nolan

Although Literature depicts a specific set of characters within a specific context, the intention of understanding the text can be achieved through a deregionalised hermeneutical analysis. The context of the nineteenth century provides the backdrop against which Raskolnikov, the protagonist of *Crime and Punishment*, elucidates his theory through the murder of Alyona Ivanovna, a pawnbroker. A temporal examination of the nineteenth century reveals a time during which the old idea of empire is evolving, through a Western model, into a centralised statehood. The standard of success for the cohesive state is achieved through coercive nationalism. St. Petersburg began as Peter the Great's manifestation of a European model that reflected 'progress'. He sought to redesign the city to align with his obsessions and ambitions. This idea of "Europeanisation" culminates in nineteenth century St. Petersburg.

H.S. Jones, in the Chapter, "The Early Utilitarians, Race, and Empire", suggests that "The later Victorian period utilitarianism was often accused of being an anachronism, and its supposed indifference to history and its insensitivity to national character were among its anachronistic qualities" (Schuktz and Varouxakis, 2005: 179). In a century rife with a compulsion towards definitive identification, categorisation, and models, it was difficult to imagine that utilitarianism had no concept of race and that the Benthamites "treated all national distinctions as accidents which should be discarded as quickly as possible" (Schuktz and Varouxakis, 2005: 179).

With this indicator of English ideology, one can understand how Western European countries came to proclaim their habits as the standard for civilisation; and how civilisation, marked by the criteria thereof, came to be the requirement for membership to the international community. One is compelled to wonder if, during the nineteenth century, utilitarianism was synonymous with civilisation and it was the practice of utilitarianism that lent its genotype to a recognized 'civilised' nation. For the utilitarians,

the utility principle –the greatest happiness for the greatest number – was the ultimate principle that ordered all ethical and legal issues. However, utilitarians were also connected to secondary principles, such as laissez-faire and representative government. John Stewart Mill, in *Considerations on Representative Government*, suggested that people who had to learn the first lesson of civilisation, obedience, would not be suited to representative government and that, in this instance, despotism was a legitimate mode of governance.

Barbra Caine argues that Mill believed that men embodied the “universal standard of human excellence” (Caine, 1992:37). H.S. Jones implies that Mill’s civilization perspective supported an unspoken assimilation of civilisation to white European civilisation” (Schuktz and Varouxakis, 2005: 185). The white European represented the standard for human excellence. Yet, the term ‘white’ -- although familiar to most as synonymous with Caucasian – is misleading. ‘White’ is not a state of being; it represents a constellation, consisting of several aspects that often go unnoticed, but that are revealed through the examination of “white” as an idea, or as an ideal. “White” represented the European, progress, religious, and moral. John S Mill, in his essay, “On Liberty”, encourages his audience to take intellectual risks. He appeals, “Who can compare what the world loses in the multitude of promising intellects combined with timid characters who dare not follow any bold, vigorous, independent train of thought lest it should land them in something that would admit of being considered irreligious or immoral?” (Mill in Cowling, 1968: 151). Through this statement and his prolific arguments in this essay, he calls the intellectual to action.

No artist creates in a vacuum; he can be nothing less than the culmination of ideas and thoughts that exist during a particular epoch. Dostoevsky’s world would have included the ideas of John S Mill. Mill focuses upon the fact that “No one can be a great thinker who does not recognize that as a thinker it is his first duty to follow his intellect to whatever conclusions that it may lead” (Mill in Cowling, 1968: 151). Raskolnikov formulates his theory before the story begins – it is this idea that provides the back-story and exposes his will to power. Raskolnikov believes in the predisposition towards superiority. It is this aspect that creates a paradox for Raskolnikov. The extraordinary man is the man who believes – and acts upon – the utility principle. The mistake that Rodya makes is that there is a permission associated with empire. The extraordinary man can never be anything but English; if he is not English, he becomes the despot.

The popularity of science that grew during the nineteenth century may have sprung from the romance with utility. Shapin and Barnes stressed the dependence of its credibility upon “studied disinterest and apparent objectivity, and suggest that once accepted, value-free science could minimize the danger of moral coercion by different kinds of political appeal” (Russell, 1983:168). Science could impose an authoritarianism due to its unchallengeable positions, or it could provide a common platform for unity among people from diverse religious and cultural backgrounds. The role of the importance of science was enconced in the social strata that enjoyed intellectualism through their social status. The members of the Bedfordshire Natural History Society were told by their Honorary Secretary in 1875 that “it is one of the chief advantages of natural history societies that they bring people of congenial tastes into personal relations” (Russell, 1983: 185). The extraordinary men, in this case, were the rich individuals: “Liebig, a German visiting the English Association in York, stated that “without a thorough knowledge of physics and chemistry, even without mineralogy, a man can be a great geologist in England” (Russell, 1983: 191). Many individuals complained about the

'decline of science', but matters were not improved by the Royal Society. Instead of voting for a distinguished astronomer as President, they chose a "non-scientific member of the Royal family, the Duke of Sussex, sixth son of George III" (Russell, 1983: 188).

The character of Raskolnikov was a metaphor for the formulaic discrepancies coming to light in the nineteenth century. With the dawn of industrialisation, the egos of the aristocracy could not be quenched. What they had lost when monarchy had been denied, they re-invented through a faux intellectualism that embedded authoritarianism into the scientific arena. Further, Raskolnikov is the culmination of the diminishment of philosophical inquiry by scientific rationalisation. The scientific community looked towards the traditional Literary and Philosophical Societies in England. Brewster believed that he could plug in to this tradition in order to validate scientific associations through an already established community of scholarship.

Raskolnikov denies the reality – the essence – of poverty. He sees himself as the extraordinary man. This is echoed in the words of Marmeladov, "...In poverty you may still preserve the nobility of your inborn feelings...." The feelings of Raskolnikov are revealed when Dostoevsky has him ponder "...his usual unpleasant and irritable feeling of loathing towards any stranger who touched or merely wanted to touch his person" (Dostoevsky, 1992: 13). Marmeladov informs us that "Mr. Lebezyatnikov, who follows all the new ideas explained that in our time compassion is forbidden by science, as is already happening in England, where they have political economy" (Dostoevsky, 1992: 14). In this opening sequence, Raskolnikov is indicative of the schism suggested by his name. The first schism is that between the 'natural man', who accepts and indulges his human nature, and the 'new man', who discards an idea such as compassion, replacing it with utility. The 'new man' is one who freely beats others; he holds the power through the simulacra of models and formulas that reduce the world to numbers.

By presenting Raskolnikov as a student – the representation of the popular ideologies espoused through education – Dostoevsky allows the reader to view the "others" through his social commentary. In order to refrain from a revisionist history, one cannot assume that Russia modeled itself upon the fascination with European progress. One must acknowledge, however, that the birth of industry in Europe created an entire constellation of utilitarian considerations. The obsession with empire, so long accepted by Europeans as the status quo, would put any country on edge – the basic idea behind empire is its "civilizing" aspect; in other words, all geographic entities viewed as "backwards" or "behind the times" were fair game for empire building. Secondly, the itinerary of 19th century Western ideology was the culmination of the nation as a state, defined by cohesion and borders. States were defined territories, the scientising rationality inherent in the very definition of "state". European society changed radically as a result of industrialisation. "The entrepreneur was the central focus of the language of class, the quintessential bourgeois, a new breed typifying the demise of traditional privilege, an individual who can make his way without landed wealth or aristocratic birth" (Pilbeam, 1990: 23). With the death of tradition, even insofar as it dealt with privilege, there is always a non-defined space in which the new bourgeois operates in an atmosphere of laissez-faire, free from governmental restraint, and therefore, often beyond the radar screen of moral justice.

The entrepreneur had no recognized place in society and was admired for his initiative and desire to challenge more than traditional forms of industrial organisation. Due to these factors, the industrial entrepreneur "led to a schizophrenic view of the capitalist...

The free competitive atmosphere in which he operated was regarded as a license for the exploitation of the weak” (Pilbeam, 1990: 23). The entrepreneur was not highly regarded in nineteenth century European society. “*Meshchanin*, the Russian term, is used colloquially to mean vulgarity, narrow-mindedness, and a lack of culture; merchants in Russia were widely regarded as cheats” (Pilbeam, 1990: 24). Marx claimed that “entrepreneurs were exclusively bourgeois; they were new men, the product of industrialisation, often barely educated; they were a fairly homogenous group; and they exercised a powerful almost occult influence on the government” (Pilbeam, 1990: 27).

A hermeneutical analysis of the text reveals that Dostoevsky is one of the first individuals to query the idea of capitalism. The importance of this notion is that once an idea is conceptualized or systematized, it is difficult to dig down through the layers of history and language that distort the original idea into an ideology. Following from this, as many powerful states align their national identity with economic systems, it is difficult to separate the entities of the constellation. Capitalism, in the context of *Crime and Punishment*, is the instrument that turns poverty into a tool of utility. Aloyanna, the pawn broker, represents the “new man”, a peasant who had transformed herself into a businesswoman. She lived in St Petersburg, probably because by 1824, peasants were allowed to settle in towns. “By the mid-1850s, the vast majority of 175, 000 merchants had worked their way up from the peasantry” (Stern, 1977: 172).

There are many individuals who believe in the myth of the “new man”, a self-made entrepreneur who was rough and ready with little schooling. On the contrary, many were from well-off backgrounds and were well educated. “Although only 2 per cent of the population in general went on to higher education, “almost half of the business elite in France and over a quarter in Germany, compared with 33 per cent in Britain and 27 per cent in the USA, received a higher education” (Pilbeam, 1990: 37). It was in St. Petersburg that scientific and technical education made rapid strides under the leadership of the Mining Institute during the later decades of the nineteenth century. “Such engineers were employed, either as managers by foreign owners or by Russian merchants who had been classically educated” (Zeldin, 1979: 114).

Raskolnikov is torn between the student, who learns his craft and expects to graduate and find work and the new man who is noted not only for his skill, but for turning situations into opportunities. Let us take the relationship between Rodya and his land lady. This woman seized the opportunity to make a match for her daughter and allowed him to live in her quarters as long as he was to wed her daughter. When the girl dies of typhus, the landlady allows Rodya to stay on as before, but asks him to sign a promissory note. “She precisely said that once I’d given her this paper, she would let me have as much more credit as I wanted and that she, for her part, would never, ever... make use of this paper before I myself paid her” (Dostoevsky, 1992: 102). The trappings of the language of the new entrepreneurs infiltrates those individuals who are sneakily utilizing people for their own means. The more business takes over the focus of society, the more utility becomes the measure of the individual.

The paradox that is immanent to the character of Raskolnikov – as well as to his theory of the extraordinary man – is revealed through Paul Ricoeur’s idea of the trace, “a physical mark capable of guiding a return to the past” (Ricoeur 1985: 78). The past is indicated by the trace. In the case of *Crime and Punishment*, the “trace” is the extraordinary man – or perhaps the trace is exemplified by the aspects that are represented through the existence of such an ideal. Everything still must be done if this trace is to be integrated within the community and its destiny. This is the source of

Dostoevsky's preoccupation. The setting aside of time, placing it into a 'past' means that it no longer exists in the present; this thinking can lead one to believe that the chronological forward movement of time has caused rectification of situations that have 'already occurred'. In other words, when the past is placed behind us, ideas that occurred seem to have been resolved, integrated, or closed. One must instead think of time as merely stretched, not ended. In this way, the idea – as a wound – still exists, and may need deeper attention. The idea of the extraordinary man, as exemplified through Napoleon for Raskolnikov, is an idea that recurs. It is not simply 'case closed'.

The character of the extraordinary man has already been absorbed into history; Raskolnikov has simply uncovered it. The analysis of the extraordinary man must include the notion of hermeneutical phenomenology, which consists of datability, lapse of time and publicness. Datability consists of "reactivating the work of interpretation that is concealed and is itself annihilated in the representation of time as a system of dates" (Ricoeur, 1985: 83). Lapse of time represents the time period that has passed between a "since then" and "until" and during which our preoccupation with a particular idea has become lax. Public time is the result of an interpretation – borne from our preoccupation – that is superimposed onto this everyday understanding, which publicises time.

In these terms, one can see how Raskolnikov, through his preoccupation with the "extraordinary man", reckons and uses measurements that make the issue his concern – in the present. This stretching of the present allows one to examine Raskolnikov's deed as documentary proof that the extraordinary man is a concept still available to society's being-in-the-world. Instead of judging the protagonist's deed as morally wrong from the onset, it is relevant to engage with the narrative context as documentary proof in the service of the explanatory comprehension of Raskolnikov's course of action.

One must ponder on what is the extraordinary man. It could be a Renaissance Man, one educated or critical in all subjects. Aristotle suggested that people possess an "educational acquaintance" with a subject. It is what a man or woman possesses who has been educated in the technique or praxis of the subject, not just its particular findings and conclusions. Such a person is "critical" in that field. Many perceive that a "professor" of the field is an expert, a specialist. But wouldn't the "professor" be a self-professed expert? Only another critic would be able to decipher the genuine quality of the individual's expertise. Then again, was the relevant factor of being a Renaissance Man having knowledge in all fields? Michelangelo saw himself as a sculpture; the public viewed him as a painter; his work displays a proficiency in both mediums. This may be the moment that indeed separates the knowledge of science from the knowing of art.

A formulaic preponderance embodies a singular idea; the knowledge of this idea validates the knower as expert. The knower rationalises knowledge through this formulaic model. The artist, on the other hand, strives to understand the formulaic episteme of the contemporary aesthetic – for the renaissance artist; the subjects would have included material and perspective. For the artist, the idea is not the embodiment of knowledge; it is rather the subject of discourse that will inform technique and manifest in praxis. Art is not theoretical; science may be. For science, there may be a time lapse between theory, formula, and manifestation of evidence. For art, the manifestation must occur on a material plane. This may be the existentialism immanent within art – one is not remembered as an artist simply because one has an idea of creating art. This is one aspect of Raskolnikov's reasoning that mutated into a type of nihilism within 19th century thought. As a student, Raskolnikov is introduced to theories; as the writer, he is bound

to manifest his ideas through narrative. The second requires risk; when an artist creates, it is the moment of greatest risk; he and his artistic manifestation are one, art and artisan do not exist separately. The artist cannot separate his idea from the artwork. He must commit through the process of praxis.

For Raskolnikov, the extraordinary man must take a risk; he must manifest his theory as object. In the 19th century context, where the “new man” is applauded for his cunning and guile, and his ability to open and run a factory, in which the workers are seen as commodities, then one may follow Raskolnikov’s deviant idea of eliminating an entrepreneur to grant ultimate freedom to those she holds in abeyance through their debt to her. Also, one must acknowledge how laws allowed such people to flourish; individuals like his landlady were able to blatantly entrap individuals under the guise of a business deal. What type of education would arm one with the knowledge necessary to thwart such questionable antics? In a society where the mode of functioning is morally questionable, it is difficult to apprehend a “norm” that is morally informed.

Another possibility for an explanation of the extraordinary man is the protean man. Robert Jay Lifton poses the theory of the protean man, “a representative modern intelligence, swamped with ideas, metaphysics, and values, and surrounded by messy facts. It labors to cope with them all” (Tanner in Hilton, 1961: 320). In *Crime and Punishment*, Raskolnikov says to Zamyotov, “Nice life you’ve got for yourself; a toll free entry into the most pleasant places... You profit in all ways... You’re an educated man, a literary man, eh?” Zamyotov replies “with dignity” that, “I finished the sixth class in gymnasium” (Dostoevsky, 1992: 160). Raskolnikov goes on to taunt him, noticing the part in his hair, the rings on his fingers and calls him a rich man. Earlier, the reader is aware that Zamyotov is an official who takes bribes, who has an “open palm”. Razumikhin captures the corruption of the time when he says, “If we look straight, in all ways – will there be many good people left?” (Dostoevsky, 1992: 133). What has clearly disappeared in the protean man is “the classical superego, the internalization of clearly criteria of right and wrong transmitted within a particular culture by parents to their children” (Hilton, 1961: 322). The use of the protean man as archetype allows the author to examine the character’s developmental process rather than establish the complete character as product. For the author, this allows the exposition to be on-going, with each thought representing a layer of cultural conflict and individual choice. Through Raskolnikov, one peers into the mind of the haunted individual who is awaiting the punishment of society. Rodya is the metaphor for the guilty individual who considers himself ‘free’ simply because the physical constraint of punishment has not become intelligible.

Razumikhin – as the protean man – can be viewed as a parody. From the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, every successful tragedy or opera that found popularity was parodied in another, ‘double’ performance. The character of Raskolnikov is actually often identified by literary theorists as comprising part of the ‘Double’ phenomenon employed by Dostoevsky. In this instance, Razumikhin may be seen as the double to Raskolnikov’s rationalisation. The exaggerated quality of Raskolnikov’s compulsion with his theory depicts the ‘false beauty’ of an idea that loses its usefulness as it moves towards deification. In the 19th century, compulsive rationalisation – resembling faith rather than intellect - is the reification of knowledge.

Crime and Punishment was the result of a re-writing of Dostoevsky’s original work, *The Drunkards*, in which the Marmeladov family is the central focus. In this case, *Crime and Punishment* itself is a “Double”. The entire time Dostoevsky is compiling his narrative, he

is entrenched in a parody – the rational man versus the protean man. The rationale man is presented as Dunia's fiancé, Luhzin, who is depicted as a progressive, yet still utilizing the excuses of the previous romantic movement : “There are passions, mistakes, but one man must also make allowances: passions testify to enthusiasm for the cause, and to the wrong external situation in which the cause finds itself. And if little has in fact been done, there also has not been much time... But something has been done: useful ideas have been spread and some useful new books, instead of the former dreamy and romantic ones... we have cut ourselves off irrevocably from the past and that, I think, is already something...” (Dostoevsky, 1992: 148). Luhzin goes on to challenge religion: “Science says love yourself before all, because everything in the world is based on self-interest. If you love only yourself, you will set your affairs up properly... economic truth adds that the more properly arranged personal affairs are, the firmer its foundations are and the better arranged its common cause... By acquiring solely and exclusively for myself, I am thereby precisely acquiring for everyone, as it were, and working so that my neighbor will have something more... as a result of universal prosperity...” The protean man, reflected through the stoic Razumikhin, disputes this stream of rationalisation in denying his own ability to digest these ideas after three years of being inundated with them, as he replies, “Wit is what I happen to lack.... There are traffickers hanging on to this common cause who in their own interest have so distorted everything they've touched that they have decidedly befouled the whole cause” (Dostoevsky, 1992: 149).

The idea of the protean man opening the portal to thought processes instead of ultimate characterisation reveals the conflict of ideas tantamount at the time. Pyotor, on page 150, refers to the increase in “upper class crime”. He cites crimes committed by people of “advanced social positions” such as a lecturer in world history and an embassy secretary. Razumikhin alludes to a Moscow lecturer who responded when asked why he forged lottery tickets, “Everybody else is getting rich one way or another, so I wanted to get rich quickly too... he wanted it quickly, without effort.... We are used to having everything handed to us, pulling ourselves up by other men's bootstraps, to having our food chewed for us” (Dostoevsky, 1992: 151). Raskolnikov passionately replies that “it all went according to theory... if you get to the consequences of what you have been preaching, it will turn out that one can go around putting a knife in other people”. Raskolnikov is consistently referred to as being “sick”, especially when he narrates the truth embedded in human intent. Rodya is not willing to accept the status quo, yet has moved so far from social connectedness, that he has created a schism. The status quo need not be the measure of an individual's “normalcy”; mediocrity need not be the measure of social acceptance. These are also paradoxical ideas revealed in this 19th century context.

However, this issue of moral responsibility loomed great within Dostoevsky's narrative and it is one that still rears its head in competitive, individualistic societies. In revisiting the concept of the extraordinary vs. the ordinary man, one would find a parallel in the theories of Comte, as read through the commentary of John Stuart Mill.

John Mill suggests “that the direct cultivation of altruism and the subordination of egoism, far beyond the point of absolute moral duty, should be one of the chief aims of education.... One must form the habit and develop the desire of being useful to others... beyond the bounds of prescribed duty” (Mill, 1968: 115). Mill also interprets Comte's idea that individuals should work for the benefit of others and not solely for remuneration and that the proper recompense for our trouble is the gratitude of society. In other words, if an individual takes pride in his work, an employer is never purchasing the

individual's time, but the singular skill that provides for the people. Further, Mills reminds us that it is this idea with which soldiers were trained. He warned, "Until laborers and employers perform the work of industry in the spirit in which soldiers perform that of an army, industry will never be moralized and military life will remain.... the chief school of moral cooperation" (Mill, 1968: 117).

Therefore, perhaps those who are schooled in moral cooperation are the extraordinary men. Rodya describes "...an extraordinary man has the right – his own right – to allow his conscience to step over certain obstacles... only in the event that the fulfillment of his ideas – perhaps salutary for all of mankind – calls for it". He goes on to explain that the extraordinary men may be viewed as criminals, since as they are creating a new law, they are violating an old one" (Dostoevsky, 1992: 259). The extraordinary man is one who has transcended man; however, if the social context is dis-eased, then transcendence necessitates that the extraordinary one experiences immersion into the 'ordinary'. One cannot be more than unless he has been all there is to be. This is the relevance of the Lazarus story to the narrative.

The Allegory of the Lazarus Story

Raskolnikov, after his confession to Sonya, asks her to read the story of Lazarus to him. The relevance of Lazarus to the story is a metaphor for the conflict between utilitarianism – the happiness of the greater – versus what Sidgwick coins 'psychological hedonism'. Writers who believed in utilitarianism agreed that everyone should seek the greatest happiness for all; blending this idea with that which suggests "that each ought to seek his own happiness" (Sidgwick, 1874: 411-12). The Lazarus story reflects the conflict between self interest and altruism. Lazarus is raised from his death by Christ; Lazarus, as well as Christ, is confined to the laws of men. Christ could have chosen to leave Lazarus; there would have been no blame imparted. However, he would have then remained a man and not seen as a transcendent figure. As the son of God, Christ must look beyond self-sacrifice and perform for the good of another. If Christ remains a man, he will account for his inaction through a rationality of self-interest. In order for Christ to transcend the nature of Man, he must sacrifice his happiness for the good of the whole. Due to the selfless quality of the Christ figure, objectivity allows him to transcend a particular viewpoint; he possesses an expanded consciousness that takes in the world more fully. The problem that permeates this stand is that how can individualism that borders on hedonism condone self-transcendence. In the contemporary context, the West views its particular perspective as universal; it imposes its standards upon other cultures. The utility inherent to this viewpoint becomes oppressive, as it is the needs of the empire that matter and not those of the oppressed.

Lazarus, relative to Christ, allows himself to be saved in order to engage with life again. Lazarus is the thrust in the face of 'natural law'. In order to understand one's life, one must understand the finality of death and the necessity of total engagement with life. Lazarus, upon hearing Christ's voice, rises and sheds his shroud. Raskolnikov, upon hearing Christ's voice through Sonya, also rises and sheds his shroud. With Sonya beside him, he is no longer selfish; she is the doppelganger, his double whom he confronts at the horizon of his conscience. On page 274, he rationalises that "life is given to me only once – I don't want to sit waiting for universal happiness" (Dostoevsky, 1992: 274). He continues, "I want to live myself; otherwise it's better not to live at all". After Sonia reads the Lazarus parable to him, Raskolnikov tells her that he is 'breaking' with everyone, as she had done. Man cannot live according to Man when he has been touched by God; God – or an idea of God – is a universal notion; it cannot be particular,

otherwise God becomes science – awaiting Man’s compulsion to categorize and characterise. Raskolnikov tells Sonia that it is all about “power”, but it is not until he returns the next day that the reader is able to see that it is through powerlessness that the individual can return to his neutral state, from which he can begin to create. “...A terrible powerlessness showed through his agitated state of mind... Sonya realised how he was suffering...” (Dostoevsky, 1992: 417). Returning to the Lazarus parable, one must consider that Christ raised Lazarus to ease the suffering of his relatives. Their sorrow and powerlessness in the face of death moved him – and “his spirit sighed”. Christ accepted their powerlessness and loved them for their ability to allow – to allow Christ to intervene.

Raskolnikov, on the other hand, confesses that he learned that “...people will never change and no one can remake them and it’s not worth the effort. It’s their law!” Raskolnikov rationalises, “...He who can spit on what is greatest will be their lawgiver, and he who dares the most will be the rightest of all. Only a blind man can fail to see it” (Dostoevsky, 1992: 418). But the women who had asked for Christ’s intervention understood that there had been instances in which blind men do see; however, these instances transcend reason and move into faith. The religious connotation is not the relevant instance; it is the idea that reason has limits and once man has defined himself through limitless possibilities, he moves beyond himself and towards something that is in-humane. Raskolnikov needed to hope – to believe in something greater than himself; he needed to remain in school so that his expression, articulated through his article, would have succumbed to the impression achieved through discourse. Raskolnikov is the most dangerous of creatures; he is the autodidact who has reified all possibilities as truths in order to define and substantiate his intelligence. He is the home-schooled student who considers himself ‘worldly’ due to his relationship with data. He is the virtual prophet announcing his own coming. One may say that he is the epitome of arrogance, paying homage to his monoglossic rationalisation.

Through the character of Raskolnikov, the antagonism immanent to the idea of freedom is revealed. It is not solely the individual who spends his life attempting to achieve freedom, and through the arrival at such freedom, happiness. The moment of greatest freedom is the achievement of freedom for the social group. Literature becomes the blueprint – the map – of societies’ conversations with the world; the embodiment of Man’s desire to eradicate the limitations imposed by an obsession with personal freedom; could it be that the ultimate point of arrival for the man obsessed with freedom is nihilism. Only the eradication of everything familiar will yield total freedom, for then he will have transcended his own life. However, in transcending his own life – Raskolnikov transcending the ordinary man – sacrifices his identity. Obsessive personal freedom allows the individual to distort reality, since only the man who possesses freedom can rationalize himself as the source of truth. The history of the self, therefore, is not enough to be the history of the world.

Fictional works, like *Crime and Punishment*, present epic characters that contain the moral disparity of the world. Dostoevsky begins with the desire to examine the mind of a murderer; he transcends that mind of a single individual, revealing series of constellations that informed ideas during the late nineteenth century. Raskolnikov, indeed, is the extraordinary man; he is a giant who discovers that the spiritual and corporeal may not be able to live at the same time. Although he commits a heinous act, Dostoevsky reveals positive qualities in him, such as paying for Marmeladov’s funeral

and protecting a young woman from harm. Through this fragmented disposition, one sees that immanent to the protagonist's personality is the possibility of the good.

The redeeming of Raskolnikov is only possible because through his personal transcendence, he is able to find familiarity with that which is good within himself; the gate to his redemption is open to him. Through redemption, Raskolnikov is able to integrate the spiritual with the corporeal through the realization - facilitated by Sonia - that the spirit must move beyond the corporeal if it is to move towards being universal. The movement of the spirit beyond the physical is the trace – left by an individual – upon the future. With an act of redemption, the future becomes real. As the tree loses its leaves and appears dead in winter, so does spiritual death appear. As the tree awakens under the warmth of the sun, growing new leaves and able to nourish itself, so the redeemed Raskolnikov is awakened through Sonia's love. Raskolnikov has purified himself; as Lazarus, he has died in order to live. He has rejected his rationalized desire to go beyond that which he is meant to be. Raskolnikov learns that the redeemed man is the extraordinary man; one who is capable of turning away from the desire of empire, towards the fulfillment of the individual's potential to be redeemed with his world. "Instead of dialectics, there was life..." (Dostoevsky, 1992:550).

Bibliography

- Caine, Barbara (1992). *Victorian Feminists*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Cowling, Maurice, Editor (1968). *Selected Writings of John Stuart Mill*. New York: Mentor Books.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor (1992) [Translated by Richard Pevear and Larisa Volokhonsky]. *Crime and Punishment*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Lifton, Robert Jay (1926). *History and Human Survival*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Pilbeam, Pamela M (1990). *The Middle Classes in Europe: 1789-1914*. Chicago: Lyceum Books.
- Ricoeur, Paul (1988). [Trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer] *Time and Narrative: Volume 3*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Russell, Colin A (1983). *Science and Social Change in Britain and Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Schultz, Bart, Georgios Varouxakis [Editors] (2005). *Utilitarianism and Empire*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Sidgwick, Henry (1874). *The Methods of Ethics*. London: Macmillan. (<http://www.archive.org/stream/methodsethics07sidggoog#page/n6/mode/2up>)
- Stern, F (1977). *Gold and Iron: Bismarck, Bleichroder, and the Building of the German Empire*. New York: Knopf Doubleday Group.
- Zeldin, T (1979). *France 1848-1945: Ambition and Love*. New York: Oxford University.